	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	10/672,040	OLIJVE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	1618
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeal All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIOF of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this or other appropriate communical IGHTS. This application is subjection.	s application. If not included ation will be mailed in due course. THIS
1. X This communication is responsive to Applicant Arguments	/Remarks Made in an Amendme	ent filed 11/03/2006.
2. X The allowed claim(s) is/are 23,25,27-40,42 and 44-49.		
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ur a)	e been received. e been received in Application Notuments have been received in of this communication to file a reflection. MENT of this application. Mitted. Note the attached EXAMII as reason(s) why the oath or deceived by the submitted. Son's Patent Drawing Review (Fig. 1)	o. 09/602,459 this national stage application from the eply complying with the requirements NER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF claration is deficient.
Paper No./Mail Date Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in t		
DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the depo attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT	sit of BIOLOGICAL MATERI	AL must be submitted. Note the
Attachment(s) 1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date 4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	6. ⊠ Interview Sumr Paper No./Mai 7. ∐ Examiner's Am	I Date <u>20070118</u> .

. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-37 (Rev. 08-06) SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Reasons for allowance

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The oil in water emulsion and the process to prepare it wherein the emulsion comprises a product ingredient selected from a nutritionally or pharmaceutically or cosmetically suitable ingredient and a recombinant collagen like peptide comprising at least one GXY domain having a length of at least 5 consecutive GXY triplets, wherein X and Y each represents an amino acid and wherein at least 20% of the amino acids of said recombinant collagen-like peptide are present in the form of consecutive GXY triplets are free of the prior art and therefore allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Election/Restrictions

Claims 23,25,27-40,42 and 44-49 are allowable. The restriction requirement between groups, as set forth in the Office action mailed on 05/04/2006, has been reconsidered in view of the allowability of claims to the elected invention pursuant to MPEP § 821.04(a). The restriction requirement is hereby withdrawn as to any claim that requires all the limitations of an allowable claim. Thus the non-elected material in claim 44 the nutritionally or cosmetically suitable ingredient does not have to be withdrawn from the claim. Because claim 23 is generic to all that was encompassed within groups I-III in the Office action mailed on 05/04/2006 the examiner already

Application/Control Number: 10/672,040 Page 3

Art Unit: 1618

conducted a search on the non-elected material, therefore the examiner withdrew the restriction requirement.

In view of the above noted withdrawal of the restriction requirement, applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Once a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

MICHAEL G. HARTLEY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER